

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

After the foregoing Amendment, claims 44-57, 59, 62, 64, and 66-72 are currently pending. Claims 58, 60-61, 63, and 65 are canceled. Claims 44-46, 48, 49-51, 59, and 64 are currently amended.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 44, 49 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,141,347 to Shaughnessy (hereinafter Shanughnessy) in view of WO 01 82645 to Emilsson (hereinafter Emilsson). Claims 45-50, 53-57, 62-64, and 68-72 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,141,347 to Shaughnessy in view of WO 01 82645 to Emilsson and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,930,248 to Langlet (hereinafter Langlet). Claims 51, 52, 58, 66 and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,141,347 to Shaughnessy and U.S. Patent No. 5, 930,248 to Langlet WO 0182645) [sic] in view of Emilsson applied to claims 1, 13, and 29-31, above and further over U.S. Patent No. 6,308,079 in view of Pan et al., (hereinafter Pan).

Regarding claim 44, none of the cited references, either alone or in combination, teach or fairly suggest *receiving a multicast indication message via a*

first one of a plurality of wireless channels, the multicast group indication message identifying a connection identifier associated with a multicast message, wherein the connection identifier indicates a second one of the plurality of wireless channels over which to receive the multicast message, as presently claimed.

As the Examiner admits, Shaughnessy fails to teach an indication of a second channel over which to receive a multicast message. Emilsson is cited to teach this. Neither Emilsson or Shaughnessy teach or suggest a *connection identifier associated with a multicast message* as presently claimed.

As previously argued, Emilsson page 5, lines 11-21 teaches that the base station transmits data on a broadcast channel for all mobile stations. The subscriber specific data is encoded by a key by a coding device in the base station and transmitted on a cell broadcast data channel. Emilsson page 5, line 32-page 6, line 6 teaches the subscriber specific data is encoded by a key and transmitted on a cell broadcast data channel that can be received by a select group that has the encryption key. Emilsson page 11 line 34-36 teaches transmitting an encryption key on a first cell broadcast control data channel. Emilsson page 12 lines 8-12 teaches transmitting encrypted entitlement information on a second cell broadcast control data channel which is decrypted by the subscriber's mobile station. The term "entitlement information" has two meanings: the first, as indirectly defined on page 8 of Emilsson, used as an encryption key; the second, on page 12, lines 23-28, used

for specific services for a specific user or group, for example, as the time of validity for a subscription.

Entitlement information is an encryption key used by the subscribers stations to receive data related to specific services. Only the subscribers stations that have received the key will be able to decipher the data. Entitlement information as taught by Emilsson is therefore not equivalent to the claimed connection identifier.

Accordingly, none of the cited references, either alone or in combination, teach or fairly suggest *receiving a multicast indication message via a first one of a plurality of wireless channels, the multicast group indication message identifying a connection identifier associated with a multicast message, wherein the connection identifier indicates a second one of the plurality of wireless channels over which to receive the multicast message*, as presently claimed in claim 44.

Independent claims 49, 59, and 64 recite similar limitations are allowable over the cited references for the same reasons provided above. The remaining dependant claims depend from claims 44, 49, 59, and 64, and are therefore allowable over the cited references for the reasons provided above.

Applicant: Farley et al.
Application No.: 09/630,024

Conclusion

If the Examiner believes that any additional minor formal matters need to be addressed in order to place this application in condition for allowance, or that a telephonic interview will help to materially advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone at the Examiner's convenience.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Farley et al.

By Robert D. Leonard/
Robert D. Leonard
Registration No. 57,204

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.
United Plaza
30 South 17th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103-4009
Telephone: (215) 568-6400
Facsimile: (215) 568-6499

RDL/kmc/jrrs
Enclosures (2)